

第 四 千 五 百 五 十 九 號      同 治 壬 申 年 五 月 十 五 日      HONGKONG, THURSDAY, 20th JUNE, 1872.      香 港 英 大 二 月 十 四 拜 四      [PRICE \$24 PER MONTH]

<p><b>ATTORNEYS.</b></p> <p>June 10. <b>GRACER.</b> Brit. ship, 1133. Runs.</p>	<p><b>DEUTSCHE NATIONAL BANK</b></p>	<p><b>NOTICE.</b></p>	<p><b>PUBLIC ATTENTION</b></p>	<p><b>TO LET</b></p>	<p><b>THE HONGKONG AND CHINA BAKERY</b></p>	<p><b>STEAM TO SHANGHAI</b></p>
---	--------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------	---	---------------------------------

S. N. Co.'s Steamers

"MADRAS."  
 ve for the above place about 24 hours  
 arrival of the next English Mail.  
 A. J. B. *Superintendent.*  
 S. N. Co.'s Office,  
 Hong. 20th June. 1872. [cf 1135  
 SHANGHAI AND HANKOW.  
 Russian Steamer  
 "RUSSIA."  
 ry, Master, having left Singapore for  
 on the 19th instant, will load as above  
 ere quick despatch.  
 Freight or Passage apply to  
 W. F. FUSPAU & Co.,  
 Agents.  
 38 Hongkong, 20th June, 1872.  
 NOTICE.  
 undersigned beg to inform the Public  
 that, beginning on the 1st inst., he carried on  
 the style of the TAY & COTTON and

te no business wha  
and all accounts

The late firm should have dealings with  
 me or take goods on credit or borrow  
 with the seal of the late TAK-TAI firm,  
 which is to be looked to for payment, the  
 signed will not be responsible. This is a  
 notice to avoid future trouble.

TAK-TAI.

1136 Hongkong, 29th June, 1872.  
 HONGKONG PIER AND GODOWN  
 COMPANY, LIMITED.

A. H. CLARK has been appointed  
 General Manager of the above Com-  
 pany and Godowns.

MICHAEL R.

131 Hongkong, 18th June, 1872.  
POLICE NOTIFICATION.  
AND Straying, a Bombay GOAT; the  
owner can have the same by applying to  
Inspector of Markets at the Central Market,  
paying all expense.  
W. M. DEANE,  
Captain Superintendent of Police.  
Police Barracks,  
18 June, 1872. {4d 1125  
HONGKONG INSURANCE COMPANY.

signed having been

agents for the above Company, are pre-  
sented and after this date to accept Marine  
on the same terms as the Local Offices.  
**JARDINE, MATHESON & Co.,**  
Agents, Hongkong Insurance Company.  
1, Queen's Road,  
Hongkong, 1st June, 1872. [1m 1825]

---

**FOR SALE.**  
Invoice of Galvanized Roofing **SHEETS.**  
Apply to

**FOR SALE.**

andod, ex "Disseuren," via Hambourg.  
MALL. Invoice of Teod-Meinhard's  
aromatic Angostura BITTERS, parti-  
cally adapted and appropriate for Tropical  
climates, and is recommended for its aroma  
and its quality.  
Apply to -  
MARQUES & Co.  
Queen's Road.  
9 Hongkong, 26th February, 1872.

---

FOR SALE,  
Just landed, ex late arrivals.

at cost price, 25 do  
ler :—  
notes at 816 50)

gen. had at the above price by the dozen.  
 Terms:—Cash only in bank notes.  
**YUNE-KEE,**  
 10, Graham Street.  
 HONGKONG, 17th June, 1872.

**DEAR SIRS, ATTENTION!!!**

**WILLIAMS & CO'S, SHANGHAI,**  
 PATENTED MACHINERY FOR CUTTING TOBACCOES.

“Smoking Mixture”.....\$2.00 per lb. tin.  
 “Happy Thought”.....1.50  
 “Eight Century,” chewing.....1.50

**WARRANTED** to be superior in quality to those picked at home, and universally wherever introduced.

AT  
No. 10, Queen's

Hongkong, 22nd May, 1872.

---

**HONGKONG RICE MILLS.**

---

**NOTICE.**

undersigned having taken over the premises heretofore known as the WEST RICE MILLS, and the spacious Goddards attached thereto; and having added the approved Machines for cleaning and polishing, is prepared to fill orders for all quantities and qualities of cleaned and polished rice at short notice. Special attention

will be carried on

style of BATTLES & Co.  
WM. WARD BATTLES.  
9 Hongkong, 21st March, 1872.

A O D A R O Z A  
HARBER and HAIRDRESSER,  
WELLINGTON ST. No. 23,  
HONGKONG.

CHARGES VERY MODERATE. [May 23

E. R. HANDLEY,  
JUSE and SHIP PLUMBER  
COPPER SMITH,  
SSE FOUNDER and GAS FITTER.  
(LATE PATERSON & HANDLEY),  
70, F. Queen Street,  
Next to the P. & O. Coal Stores,  
HONGKONG. [Sept. 15

## Consignment

C.O.'S S. S. PROVENANCE, FROM  
 MARSEILLES.  
 ASSIGNEES of Cargo, per S.S. *Provenance*  
 from Marseilles are requested to send in  
 bills of Lading to the undersigned, and to  
 delivery of their goods at the Company's  
 wharves, remaining unclaimed after 12 o'clock  
 WEDNESDAY, the 22nd inst., will be subject  
 to the insurance will be effected.  
 A. CODILL,  
*Principal Agent.*  
 34 HONGKONG, 19th June 1872.

NOTICE.  
 ASSIGNEES OF OPTIONAL CARGO,  
 C.O. S. S. *MONTELUZ*,  
 FROM LIVERPOOL.  
 Pending Orders must be obtained from  
 undersigned not later than the 29th  
 inst. for shipment to order.  
 BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE,  
*Agents.*  
 16 HONGKONG, 18th June, 1872.



## The Chronicle and Directory for 1872.

## NOW READY.

THIS WORK, now in the Tenth year of its existence, is ready for delivery. It has been compiled and printed at the Daily Press Office, from the best and most authentic sources, and no pains have been spared to make the work complete in all respects.

In addition to the usual varied and voluminous information, the value of the "CHRONICLE AND DIRECTORY FOR 1872" will be further augmented by the addition of a Chromo-lithograph plate of the NEW CODE OF SIGNALS IN USE AT THE PEAK.

## THE VARIOUS HOUSE-FLAHS.

(Designed expressly for this Work.)

## MAPS OF HONGKONG, JAPAN, AND OF THE COAST OF CHINA.

besides other local information and statistics collected to date of publication, tending to make this work in every way suitable for Public, Mercantile, and General Offices.

The Directory will be published in Two Forms, Complete at \$5; or with the Lists of Residents, Port Directories, Maps, &c., at \$8.

Orders for Copies may be sent to the Daily Press Office, or to the following Agents:-

Singapore..... Mr. PATRICK CAMPBELL.  
 Amoy..... Messrs. WILSON, NICHOLLS & Co.  
 Formosa..... WILSON, NICHOLLS & Co.  
 Hongkong..... HEDDE & Co.  
 Ningpo..... HALL & HOLZ.  
 Shanghai..... KELLY & Co.  
 Hankow..... HALL & HOLZ and KELLY.  
 Peking..... HALL & HOLZ and KELLY.  
 Tientsin..... HALL & HOLZ and KELLY.  
 Yokohama..... The C. & F. TRADING CO.  
 Nagasaki..... The C. & F. TRADING CO.  
 Yokohama..... Messrs. LANE, CRAWFORD & Co.  
 Manila..... Messrs. J. R. LOYAGA & Co.  
 Singapore..... Messrs. DABNEY & Co.  
 Calcutta..... Messrs. ALLEN, O'CONNOR & Co.  
 London..... G. & J. ALLEN, O'CONNOR & Co.  
 New York..... Messrs. TAYLOR & Co.  
 San Francisco..... Messrs. S. M. PETTINGILL & Co.  
 37, Park Row.

## NOW READY.

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE TRADE REPORT for the year 1871. Price \$10.  
 Apply at the Daily Press Office.  
 Hongkong, 22nd January, 1872.

The delivery of the Daily Press from this office commenced on Wednesday morning at 10.30, and the last messenger left the office at 10.47.

## The Daily Press.

HONGKONG, JUNE 20th, 1872.

Now that a commencement has been made in enforcing the suppression of gambling, it is felt that the Ordinances are very severe, and that it is doubtful whether they can be advantageously put into practice. To attempt absolutely to put down gambling without the intervention of the Police Force, is obviously an absurdity. Under such circumstances, these charged with the task must be dependent upon native information, and every one knows that such information is certain to be, if not misleading, at least defective. The natives upon whom the duty of informing devolves, will be so placed that they can sell their silence at a considerable price, and if such is the case, we may be pretty well assured as to what use such a class of Chinese informants will turn their powers. On the other hand, if the Police be authorized to hunt out illegal gambling houses, the Force itself will become corrupted, and in addition to having a vast amount of gambling going on, we shall have an utterly worthless Police Force. The measure adopted by Sir ROBERT MACDONNELL, purporting to steer clear of both the horns of this dilemma, but it hands upon one of them. It is true the Police are not corrupted, but still we have but very defective information concerning the gambling; and thus while a vast amount of illegal play is known to be going on in the Colony undetected, we find the law at odd times enforced with very great, and it may be held so by the landlords are concerned, with undue severity. Under these circumstances, it might almost be thought that there is nothing for it but either to give up the attempt at suppressing gambling altogether, and leave the matter alone, or beyond our control, or to revert to the licensing system, which was so universally unpopular, and led to so little practical good. But there is the insuperable objection to the licensing system that it gives Government countenance to a vice which we have no desire whatever to sanction, and to a great extent, by making it respectable, encourages it among the better classes of Chinese. This we have no wish to do; and the point, therefore, is, whether we can discountenance gambling in any way which will be subject to preserve our moral status on the subject, and yet shall not be so inquisitorial as to lead to the difficulties which always crop up when we attempt absolutely either to regulate or to suppress it. It might be thought, with the great difficulties against which we have to contend, that we should be justified in attempting our best, to leave the matter alone; and but for one consideration this conclusion might be correct. Although we could not be greatly blamed for failing in so difficult a task as putting down gambling without the moral support of the Chinese Community, it would not be desirable that gambling in Hongkong should be so notoriously unregulated that the place would become a recognised gambling resort for the South of China. This end, however, might be attained without pushing matters to the extreme of taking out every small gambling resort in the Colony, and so affording a grand field for corrupting the police. Gambling might be definitely declared illegal, and an arrangement made that, whenever, it was carried on in a notorious way, and an information was laid by respectable residents in the neighbourhood of the house, steps would be taken to put it down. The fact that there would always be a likelihood of police interference would have a deterrent effect upon large numbers of the Chinese, and it would be sufficient to vindictive our national character, inasmuch as we should not give any sanction or countenance to the vice, but take the best steps in our power to suppress it. The plan which was devised by Sir ROBERT MACDONNELL, and is at present in force, has some defects, but its cardinal defect is that when the regulations were promulgated the native Com-

munity were definitely informed that they need not in any way fear police interference; a step undoubtedly impolitic, as throwing a moral influence which if used carefully would have a powerfully restraining effect. Sir ROBERT's regulations were also defective, in the points above noticed, that the informants are certain to be professional spies, who will make their money, not by stating where gambling is going on, but by helping the keepers of gambling houses to avoid detection. It might, however, be possible, by carrying out such suggestions as that thrown out above, so to frame the law that it would avoid on the one hand the bribery which must result from its being too inquisitorial in character, and on the other hand, the scandal which must attach to the good name of the Colony, if we either countenance gambling by licensing certain houses, or allow it to ride rampant, by failing to adopt any measures whatever to restrain it at least within such bounds as decency and self-respect must suggest.

A home telegram will be ready for delivery to Subscribers at 6 p.m. to-day.

The jurors summoned for the present session will not be required to-day, or any further, as the calendar was exhausted yesterday. It is peculiar that the session should have produced not a single conviction.

The Acting Chief-Justice referred yesterday to the pending application for a Special Jury certificate in the case of *Bellion v. Agnew*, and stated that he had found a very recent authority showing that it was imperative to make the application for a Special Jury certificate. Under the Act, the General Court should not refuse the application on the existing authorities.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government. It was understood that the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

With regard to the statement to the effect that there was a doubt as to whether the port of Kowloon would be opened, we understand that the misapprehension was made with reference to the report of the Inspector-General of Customs, and that that visit was not with the object of opening the port at once, but of making the necessary preliminary arrangements, which, of course, would be subject to the approval of the Government.

the basement floor, and the west elevation of the house, both of which were examined, stating that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

His Lordship said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

## POLICE INTELLIGENCE.

## Before F. W. MITCHELL, Esq.

P. O. Cronin, No. 9, charged on duty in the harbor saw a small boat with a man in it, a hawker of cakes, pulling away from him in a very suspicious manner. He gave chase, and defendant would not stop. On overtaking the boat he found the man, who was a Chinese, and asked him to get out of the boat, he pointed out a woman on board one of Mr. Cronin's boats, and he took her into custody also. The woman said the rice was only sweepings, and she gave it to her friends to feed the fowls he had under his care belonging to her. As the rice turned out to be actually only sweepings, the two defendants were discharged.

A KSA FIGHT. P. O. No. 9, charged on duty in the harbor saw a small boat with a man in it, a hawker of cakes, pulling away from him in a very suspicious manner. He gave chase, and defendant would not stop. On overtaking the boat he found the man, who was a Chinese, and asked him to get out of the boat, he pointed out a woman on board one of Mr. Cronin's boats, and he took her into custody also. The woman said the rice was only sweepings, and she gave it to her friends to feed the fowls he had under his care belonging to her. As the rice turned out to be actually only sweepings, the two defendants were discharged.

A young Chinese girl, 15 years and 5 months old, appeared to change two women connected with a robbery in Aberdeen-street, and forcibly detaining her in a house in Tam-a-choy street. She was taken away to a house in Tam-a-choy street, and there confined in a room by the defendants, who kept watch over her. She made several attempts to escape, but was prevented by the defendants, and was finally dragged up stairs again; she also made several attempts to get to the window, but was prevented by the defendants. She got released out of the house by the police, and was taken to the police station.

Wong Ah-fong, was charged with committing perjury in the Sumner Court on the 27th May. Mr. Drummond, instructed by Messrs. Caldwell and Breckin, defended the prisoner. The information set out the evidence alleged to be false, it amounted to the Attorney-General, said to a charge of highway robbery against Young-wai-yow, who was at the time plaintiff in an action for malicious prosecution against the prisoner. The charge was so serious that, as the Attorney-General said, it was a matter of great importance to the public, and that it was necessary to have the matter tried by a jury. The story of the perjury was that he had obtained two witnesses for the prosecution, one of whom was a Chinese, and the other was a European, and that they had both sworn to the facts of the case. The witness for the prosecution, a Chinese, was a man named Young-wai-yow, who was at the time plaintiff in an action for malicious prosecution against the prisoner. The witness for the prosecution, a European, was a man named Young-wai-yow, who was at the time plaintiff in an action for malicious prosecution against the prisoner.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

Mr. Drummond addressed the jury on the possibility that the money had been stolen from the prisoner in the crowd, and that he made the charge for the purpose of getting the money. He said that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

denied all things necessary to himself and wife, and that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

denied all things necessary to himself and wife, and that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

denied all things necessary to himself and wife, and that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning. In cross-examination, the witness stated that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.

denied all things necessary to himself and wife, and that he was not sure whether the coffee mill, or both prisoners, came up by the trap-door at first in the morning.



For News ..... 34 cents per half  
For Newspapers ..... 8 each.  
For Books and { not exceeding 1 ounce  
Patterns ..... { " " " "  
{ every additional " " " "  
F. W. MITCHELL  
Postmaster

General Post Office,  
Hongkong, 20th December, 1871.

It is hereby notified that arrangements  
have been completed under which correspondence  
from Hongkong may be forwarded to Nip-  
pon Shanghai, and to Hioego via Yokohama  
United States Mail Packets, and that the  
same may be forwarded to Hongkong, and may  
be forwarded from Nagasaki and  
by means of the United States' Pack  
Shanghai and Yokohama respectively.

The rates of postage chargeable on such  
correspondence in the future for each half  
on Letters, two cents on each Newspaper  
two cents on each two ounces of Books  
Packets of Samples of Merchandise, in ac-  
cordance to the rates specified in the Table of  
Postage at present in force.

F. W. MITCHELL  
Postmaster

General Post Office,  
Hongkong, 18th January, 1871.



### Business Announcements.

[illegible]